



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/675,780	09/28/2000	Larry P. Mason	020431.0732	8341
7590	03/25/2004		EXAMINER	
Baker Botts LLP 2001 Ross Avenue Dallas, TX 75201-2980			NGUYEN, THU HA T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2155	
			DATE MAILED: 03/25/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/675,780	MASON, LARRY P.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Thu Ha T. Nguyen	2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 September 2000.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2,3</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1- 30 are presented for examination.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claim 1 recites the limitation "the transformation engine unable to interpret the custom content generation tags" in page 17, lines 9-10 are unclear. Appropriate correction is required.

4. Claim 3 recites the limitation "the unprocessed custom content generation tags" in page 17, line 27. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --  
(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 37 1(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

6. Claims 1-2, 8-12, 18-22, and 26-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by **Claussen et al.**, (hereinafter Claussen) U.S. Patent No. 6,675,354.

7. As to claim 1, **Claussen** teaches the invention as claimed, including a system for transforming custom content generation tags, comprising:

a web server operable to receive a request from a web browser, the request identifying a file comprising one or more custom content generation tags that the web browser is unable to interpret, and the web server operable to communicate the custom content generation tags (abstract, figures 1, 2, col. 2 lines 2-65, col. 3 lines 30-43, col. lines 1-col. 6 lines 6);

a transformation engine operable to receive the custom content generation tags, transform the custom content generation tags into first output that the web browser is able to interpret, and communicate the first output to the web server, the transformation engine unable to interpret the custom content generation tags (abstract, col. 3 lines 30-42, col. 10 lines 34-42); and

the web server further operable to receive the first output and to communicate the first output to the web browser in response to the request (col. 5 lines 25-45).

8. As to claim 2, **Claussen** teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the first output comprises code selected from the group consisting of HyperText Markup

Language (HTML) code, Extensible Markup Language (XML) code, and Wireless Markup Language (WML) code (col. 1 lines 38-col. 2 lines 21).

9. As to claim 8, **Claussen** teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the transformation engine comprises an Extensible Stylesheet Language Transformation (XSLT) engine, the XSLT engine operable to transform the custom content generation tags using an Extensible Stylesheet Language (XSL) stylesheet (figure 1, col. 2 lines 2-21, col. 3 lines 30-42, col. 10 lines 35-44).

10. As to claim 9, **Claussen** teaches the invention as claimed wherein the XSL stylesheet comprises one or more templates corresponding to each custom content generation tag, the templates comprising HTML code to replace the corresponding custom content generation tag (abstract).

11. As to claim 10, **Claussen** teaches the invention as claimed, wherein one or more of the templates comprise code operable to generate HTML code to replace the corresponding custom content generation tag (abstract, col. 10 lines 35-42).

12. As to claim 11, **Claussen** teaches the invention as claimed, including method for transforming custom content generation tags, comprising: receiving a request from a web browser for a file comprising one or more custom content generation tags that the web browser is unable to interpret (abstract, figures 1, 2, col. 2

lines 2-65, col. 3 lines 30-43, col. lines 1-col. 6 lines 6); transforming the custom content generation tags using a transformation engine into first output that the web browser is able to interpret, the transformation engine unable to interpret the custom content generation tags (abstract, col. 3 lines 30-42, col. 10 lines 34-42); and communicating the first output to the web browser in response to the request (col. 5 lines 25-45).

13. As to claim 21, **Claussen** teaches the invention as claimed, including custom tag transformation software embodied in a computer-readable medium and operable to: receive a request from a web browser for a file comprising one or more custom content generation tags that the web browser is unable to interpret (abstract, figures 1, 2, col. 2 lines 2-65, col. 3 lines 30-43, col. lines 1-col. 6 lines 6); transform the custom content generation tags into first output that the web browser is able to interpret (abstract, col. 3 lines 30-42, col. 10 lines 34-42); and communicate the first output to the web browser in response to the request (col. 5 lines 25-45).

14. As to claim 29, **Claussen** teaches the invention as claimed, including a system for transforming custom content generation tags, comprising: means for receiving a request from a web browser for a file comprising one or more custom content generation tags that the web browser is unable to interpret (abstract, figures 1, 2, col. 2 lines 2-65, col. 3 lines 30-43, col. lines 1-col. 6 lines 6); means for transforming the custom content generation tags into first output that the web browser is able to interpret (abstract, col. 3 lines 30-42, col. 10 lines 34-42); and means for communicating the first output to the web browser in response to the request (col. 5 lines 25-45).

15. As to claim 12, 18-20, 22 and 26-28, they are system claims directed to transform custom content generation tags of method claims 2, and 8-10. Claims 12, 18-20, 22 and 26-28 have similar limitations to claims 2 and 8-10; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

#### **Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103**

16. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

17. Claims 3-7, 13-17, 23-25 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over **Claussen et al.**, (hereinafter Claussen) U.S. Patent No. **6,675,354**, in view of **Britton et al.**, (hereinafter Britton) U.S. Patent No. **6,535,896**.

18. As to claim 3, **Claussen** teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the web server communicating the unprocessed custom content generation tags to the transformation engine (abstract, col. 3 lines 30-42, col. 10 lines 34-42); and the web server further operable to communicate the web browser with the first output in response to the request (col. 5 lines 25-45). **Claussen** does not explicitly teach the

requested file further comprises one or more standard content generation tags that the web browser is unable to interpret; the system further comprises a web page processing engine operable to interpret the standard content generation tags and generate second output that the web browser is able to interpret, the web page processing engine unable to interpret the custom content generation tags; the web page processing engine further operable to communicate the second output to the web server; and web server further operable to communicate the second output to the web browser. However, **Britton** teaches the requested file further comprises one or more standard content generation tags that the web browser is unable to interpret; the system further comprises a web page processing engine operable to interpret the standard content generation tags and generate second output that the web browser is able to interpret, the web page processing engine unable to interpret the custom content generation tags; the web page processing engine further operable to communicate the second output to the web server; and web server further operable to communicate the second output to the web browser (abstract, col. 6 lines 7-col. 7 lines 62). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of **Claussen and Britton** to have the web page processing engine operable to interpret the standard content generation tags and generate second output that the web browser is able to interpret because it would provide an efficient communications system that can modify and format web page content for various types of pervasive computing devices.

Art Unit: 2155

19. As to claim 4, **Britton** teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the web server is operable to communicate the second output to the transformation engine with the unprocessed custom content generation tags; and the transformation engine is operable to communicate the second output back to the web server with the first output (abstract, col. 6 lines 7-col. 7 lines 62). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of **Claussen and Britton** to have the same motivation as set forth in claim 3, supra.

20. As to claim 5, **Claussen** teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the requested file comprises a JAVASERVER PAGE (JSP) file; the standard content generation tags comprise JSP standard tags; the custom content generation tags comprise JSP custom tags (col. 5 lines 48-col. 6 lines 32); however, **Claussen** does not explicitly teach web page processing engine comprises a JSP engine unable to process the JSP custom tags. **Britton** teaches web page processing engine comprises a JSP engine unable to process the JSP custom tags (abstract, col. 6 lines 7-col. 7 lines 62). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of **Claussen and Britton** to have the same motivation as set forth in claim 3, supra.

21. As to claim 6, **Claussen** teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the first and second output comprises code selected from the group consisting of HyperText

Markup Language (HTML) code, Extensible Markup Language (XML) code, and Wireless Markup Language (WML) code (col. 1 lines 38-col. 2 lines 21).

22. As to claim 7, **Britton** teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the web page processing engine is operable to attach a header to the unprocessed custom content generation tags, the header indicating the presence of the unprocessed custom content generation tags; and the web server is operable to communicate the unprocessed custom content generation tags to the transformation engine in response to the header (abstract, figure 1, col. 6 lines 7-col. 7 lines 62). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of **Claussen and Britton** to have the same motivation as set forth in claim 3, supra.

23. As to claim 13-17, 23-25, and 30 they are system claims directed to transform custom content generation tags of method claims 3-7. Claims 13-17, 23-25 and 30 have similar limitations to claims 3-7; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

### Conclusion

24. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:
25. US006654949B1, monitoring the execution of hybrid source code.
26. US006263332B1, query processing of structured document.
27. US006654784B1, computing architecture.
28. US2001/0049702, service side filtering XML messages in a distributed network.
29. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thu Ha Nguyen, whose telephone number is (703) 305-7447. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain T. Alam, can be reached at (703) 308-6662.

Any inquiry of a general nature of relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.

The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9306 for regular communications.

Thu Ha Nguyen

March 19, 2004

  
HOSAIN ALAM  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER